REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-25 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Xu et al. (U.S. Patent 2002/0070961 A1), hereinafter "Xu." The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, it is noted that claim 1 recites a method of focusing on an input item in an object picture generated by an object program by "interpreting the object program for displaying the object picture... to generate input item map information necessary for focusing on the input items." In contrast, Xu discloses a method of focusing on a link (i.e., an input item) in a frame (i.e., a markup picture) by a Web browser function. That is, Xu only discloses links and markup pictures, but does not disclose object pictures. An object picture is a screen through which data is output according to an object program. Frames, on the other hand, are markup pictures displayed according to a markup document. To be clear, frames are not object pictures. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Xu fails to disclose, implicitly or explicitly, an object picture, as recited in claim 1. Similarly, while the method of Xu does enumerate frames and links in the frames (paragraph [0045]), such an enumeration is not done by interpreting an object program. In fact, Xu makes no reference to an object program, and does not implicitly or explicitly suggest an interpreting of an object program. Rather, in Xu, the frames and the links therein are enumerated by a Web browser identifying the frames and the links within a displayed Web page (paragraph [0067]). Specifically, Xu teaches a method of enumerating the frames and links by creating an access point in the Web browser, and then using the access point to locate the frames and links displayed in the Web browser (paragraph [0067] and paragraph [0069]). Accordingly, the Web browser does not utilize the frame's source document (i.e., the markup document) to identify the links in the frame. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Xu fails to disclose, implicitly or explicitly, an interpreting of an object program, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, it is noted that claim 1 recites the markup picture "comprising additional information related to the object picture." In contrast, Xu teaches a Web page that only includes a plurality of frames (i.e., markup pictures), and does not include additional information.

Specifically, as the Title and the Abstract suggest, Xu relates to a method of moving a focus from an input item of one frame to an input item of a different frame. Thus, as illustrated in FIG. 4, Xu discloses a Web page consisting only of a plurality of frames. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Xu fails to disclose, implicitly or explicitly, a markup picture including an object picture and additional information, as recited in claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of claim 2, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 1 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. In particular, it is noted that while claim 2 recites the object program as having an independent program structure, Xu does not disclose an object program.

Regarding the rejection of claim 3, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 1 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. In particular, it is noted that while claim 3 recites an interpreting of the object program to generate the input item map, Xu discloses a method of enumerating input items by a Web browser locating the input items in a displayed web page. That is, Xu does not disclose an interpreting of an object program, as recited in claim 3.

Regarding the rejection of claim 4, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 3 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 5, it is noted that claim 5 recites a transmitting of a message from a markup interpretation engine to an object interpretation engine "for moving an input item focus... to inside of the object picture." In contrast, Xu teaches a method of moving a focus **from one markup picture (frame) to another markup picture** (Title, Abstract, and paragraph [0043]). That is, Xu does not suggest moving the focus to an object picture, but rather having the focus "jump between frames" (paragraph [0043]), which are markup pictures. The Applicants note that Xu only discloses links and markup pictures, but does not disclose object pictures. An object picture is a screen through which data is output according to an object program. Frames, on the other hand, are markup pictures displayed according to a markup document. To be clear, frames are not object pictures. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Xu fails to disclose, implicitly or explicitly, an object picture, as recited in claim 5.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 6, it is noted that claim 6 recites a transmitting of a message from an object interpretation engine to a markup interpretation engine

"for moving an input item focus from inside of the object picture." In contrast, Xu teaches a method of moving a focus **from one markup picture (frame) to another markup picture** (Title, Abstract, and paragraph [0043]). That is, Xu does not suggest moving the focus from an object picture, but rather having the focus "jump between frames" (paragraph [0043]), which are markup pictures. The Applicants note that Xu only discloses links and markup pictures, but does not disclose object pictures. An object picture is a screen through which data is output according to an object program. Frames, on the other hand, are markup pictures displayed according to a markup document. To be clear, frames are not object pictures. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Xu fails to disclose, implicitly or explicitly, an object picture, as recited in claim 6.

Regarding the rejection of claim 7, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 5 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of claim 8, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 7 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of claim 9, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 5 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 10, it is noted that claim 10 recites an information storage medium including an object program to display an object picture having at least one input item, the object program including "information on an input item type, information on a position of an input item, and information on an identification of an input item necessary for generating input item map information." In contrast, Xu discloses a method of enumerating links (i.e., input items) in a frame (i.e., a markup picture) by a Web browser function. That is, Xu only discloses links and markup pictures, but does not disclose object pictures. An object picture is a screen through which data is output according to an object program. Frames, on the other hand, are markup pictures displayed according to a markup document. To be clear, frames are not object pictures. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Xu fails to disclose, implicitly or explicitly, an object picture, as recited in claim 10. Similarly, while the method of Xu does enumerate frames and links in the frames (paragraph [0045]), such an enumeration is not done with information contained in an object program. In fact, Xu makes no reference to an object program, and does not implicitly or explicitly suggest information included in an object program. Rather, in Xu, the frames and the links therein are enumerated by a Web browser

identifying the frames and the links within a displayed Web page (paragraph [0067]). While the present claim recites the location information of the input items as included in the object program, the Web browser disclosed in Xu determines the locations by the above-mentioned method of enumerating the links (paragraph [0045]). Specifically, Xu teaches a method of enumerating the frames and links by creating an access point in the Web browser, and then using the access point to locate the frames and links displayed in the Web browser (paragraph [0067] and paragraph [0069]). Accordingly, the Web browser does not utilize the frame's source document (i.e., does not use information included in an object program) to identify or locate the links in the frame. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Xu fails to disclose, implicitly or explicitly, an object program, as recited in claim 10.

Regarding the rejection of claim 11, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 10 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of claim 12, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 10 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. In particular, it is noted that while claim 12 recites the object program as having an independent program structure, Xu does not disclose an object program.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 13, it is noted that claim 13 recites "transmitting a message for moving a focus on one of the object picture input items." In contrast, Xu teaches a method of moving a focus **from one markup picture (frame) to another markup picture** (Title, Abstract, and paragraph [0043]). That is, Xu does not suggest moving the focus from an object picture, but rather having the focus "jump between frames" (paragraph [0043]), which are markup pictures. The Applicants note that Xu only discloses links and markup pictures, but does not disclose object pictures. An object picture is a screen through which data is output according to an object program. Frames, on the other hand, are markup pictures displayed according to a markup document. To be clear, frames are not object pictures. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Xu fails to disclose, implicitly or explicitly, an object picture, as recited in claim 13.

Regarding the rejection of claims 14-16, it is noted that these claims depend from claim 13 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 17, it is noted that claim 17 recites "moving an input item focus... from a markup picture input item to an object picture input item, and from

an object picture input item to a markup picture input item according to a predetermined order." In contrast, Xu teaches a method of moving a focus **from one markup picture (frame) to another markup picture** (Title, Abstract, and paragraph [0043]). That is, Xu does not suggest moving the focus from an object picture or to an object picture, but rather having the focus "jump between frames" (paragraph [0043]), which are markup pictures. The Applicants note that Xu only discloses links and markup pictures, but does not disclose object pictures. An object picture is a screen through which data is output according to an object program. Frames, on the other hand, are markup pictures displayed according to a markup document. To be clear, frames are not object pictures. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Xu fails to disclose, implicitly or explicitly, an object picture, as recited in claim 17.

Regarding the rejection of claims 18-20, it is noted that these claims depend from claim 17 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 21, it is noted that claim 21 recites "moving an input item focus... from a markup picture input item to a DVD object picture input item, and from a DVD object picture input item to a markup picture input item." In contrast, Xu teaches a method of moving a focus **from one markup picture (frame) to another markup picture** (Title, Abstract, and paragraph [0043]). That is, Xu does not suggest moving the focus from an object picture or to an object picture, but rather having the focus "jump between frames" (paragraph [0043]), which are markup pictures. The Applicants note that Xu only discloses links and markup pictures, but does not disclose object pictures. An object picture is a screen through which data is output according to an object program. Frames, on the other hand, are markup pictures displayed according to a markup document. To be clear, frames are not object pictures. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Xu fails to disclose, implicitly or explicitly, an object picture, as recited in claim 21.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 22, it is noted that claim 22 recites "moving an input item focus... from an interactive picture input item to an object picture input item, and from an object picture input item to an interactive picture input item." In contrast, Xu teaches a method of moving a focus **from one markup picture (frame) to another markup picture** (Title, Abstract, and paragraph [0043]). That is, Xu does not suggest moving the focus from an interactive picture (in which the object picture is embedded) or to an interactive picture (in which the object picture is embedded), but rather having the focus "jump between frames" (paragraph

6

[0043]), which are markup pictures. The Applicants note that Xu only discloses links and markup pictures, but does not disclose object pictures. An object picture is a screen through which data is output according to an object program. Frames, on the other hand, are markup pictures displayed according to a markup document. To be clear, frames are not object pictures. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Xu fails to disclose, implicitly or explicitly, an object picture, as recited in claim 22.

Regarding the rejections of claims 23-25, it is noted that these claims depend from claim 22 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Based on the foregoing, this rejection is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: _2/27/08_   By: _____

Michael D. Stein
Registration No. 37,240

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510